



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,825	11/22/2002	Goran Eliasson	00173.0020.PCUS00	9651

28694 7590 09/11/2003

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE LLP
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
BOX 34
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

CHENEVERT, PAUL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3612

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,825

Applicant(s)

ELIASSON, GORAN

Examiner

Paul A. Chenevert

Art Unit

3612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10, 13 and 16-19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 November 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the circuit breaker of claims 11 & 20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Paragraph 1, line 4, "waist-controlled trucks (articulated haulers)" is unclear and it is thought that the Applicant is describing a "waste-dumping truck". This possible error occurs at other locations in the Specification.
 - b. Paragraph 12, lines 1-3, "Figure 1" should be changed to "Figure 3".
 - c. Paragraph 26, line 4, "clevis 21" should be changed to "clevis 24".Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 11 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for of a driver's presence detector, does not reasonably provide enablement for an electrical circuit breaker. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 12, 14, & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oak et al. in view of Tury.

Oka et al. disclose a tipping dump body having an electrical control to hold the dump body in a locked position, as is shown in Figure 12.

However, Oka et al. do not expressly disclose that the control is designed to place the dump body in the hold position when the driver leaves the seat.

Art Unit: 3612

Tury discloses a control (LCU 220), which places a vehicle in a safe condition when the driver leaves the seat via a driver seat detector (121).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the control of Oka et al., to employ a driver's seat detector, as taught by Tury.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to make the dump truck a safer vehicle to operate, as is desired in this vehicle invention.

Therefore, it would have been a desirable and thus a prima facie obvious modification of the dump body of Oka et al. by combining a driver's seat detector with the holding control to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1, 12, & 14, as taught by the prior references' motivation, and not hindsight from the applicants disclosure.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3-10, 13, & 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not show or make obvious Applicant's spring-loaded operating lever in conjunction with an electrical driver's seat detector.

Art Unit: 3612

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pieperhoff teaches a safety feature where the operator must acknowledge a sensor prior to operating a lift. Koga teaches a driver's seat presence detector. Suman et al. teach a driver's presence detector. Gotz teaches a driver's presence in a steering wheel. Hori et al. teach a multi-directional spring-loaded operating lever.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Chenevert whose telephone number is 703-305-0837. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn D. Dayoan can be reached on 703-308-3102. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1134.

Paul A. Chenevert
Examiner
Art Unit 3612

PAC

pac

Stephenson 5/4/03
STEPHENSON
PREVIOUS